

## B2B Procedures

- Customer and Site Details (version change)
- Service Order
- Meter Data (version change)
- One Way Notification
- Technical Delivery Specification

## CONSULTATION – First Stage

## CONSULTATION PARTICIPANT RESPONSE TEMPLATE

***Participant:*** Endeavour Energy

***Completion Date:*** 13/01/2020

# Table of Contents

- 1. Service Order Process..... 3
- 2. One Way Notification Process ..... 4
- 3. Technical Delivery Specification ..... 5
- 4. Consultation questions..... 6

## 1. Service Order Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		PurposeforVisit field in Table 13	This is shown as optional (O) for the Metering Service Works Move Meter service order type. We suggest that this be shown as Agreement Only (AO) which we believe was the intent for this new field.
		CustomerType field in Table 13	We note adding a new value to an existing field with a list of allowable value requires a schema change. We request that AEMO considers how this schema change can be made such that in future any further changes to a list of allowable values can be updated without any further schema changes.

## 2. One Way Notification Process

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
	4.1.3.b		This clause should be updated to include the new proposed ServiceOrderID in the example

### 3. Technical Delivery Specification

Participant Name	Old Clause No	New Clause No	Comments
		5.8	For clarity, the number of kilobyte for each megabyte should be defined

## 4. Consultation questions

Question 1: Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.1? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No – provide reason" / "Other – provide reason")

Yes, we support the proposed change because it makes it clear that agreement from the recipient is required before these new fields are utilised. We note that a schema change is required to include these new fields which means that parties who do not intend to use these fields are impacted by the change. We request AEMO consider the technological solutions for B2B messaging such that any future changes does not compel other parties, who are not interested in the changes, from having to make costly system changes.

Question 2: Are there additional enumerated fields whose addition to the Metering Service Works SO the IEC should consider? Please detail them.

We wish to suggest other additional fields to be added: Section Number and DP Number. These fields are required to uniquely identify a parcel of land for the Allocate NMI process. Currently as a work around the FormNumber and the FormReference fields are used, however given that this change requires a schema change we believe that this is an opportunity to define appropriate fields for this information. We have also requested for the same fields to be included in MSATS under the MSATS Standing Data Review program with the aim to have these two additional fields available end to end from the Allocate NMI to NMI Discovery.

Question 3: Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.2? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No" / "Other – provide reason")

Yes, we support the proposed change because it will help to clarify how the Supply Abolishment service order can be used in NSW.

Question 4: Do you support the changes detailed in section 5.1.3? (Answer should be one of "Yes" / "No – provide reason" / "Other – provide reason")

Yes, we support the change because it will allow for retailers to better communicate when a NMI request is for a non-contestable unmetered load.

Question 5: Given that the MFIN, which is XML-based, can be used for the same purpose as the MXN and avoids the issue related to partial acceptance of the MXN, do participants support the continued usage of the CSV-based MXN?

We do not support the continued usage of the CSV-based MXN if the MFIN provides the same purpose. This would help to reduce the need to support a duplicate transaction.

Question 6: If the MXN were to be retired, would your organisation prefer Option 1 or Option 2 as presented above?

We prefer option 1 (Retire the MXN as part of the updating of the MFIN), but also happy to support option 2 (Give the MXN an extension past this change window).

Question 7: If the MXN were to be retired, what would be the appropriate timeframe in which to retire it?

We believe if option 2 is to be adopted then 12 months from the final determination of this consultation should be sufficient.

Question 8: Will a 10 MB maximum file size for MTRD transactions cause substantial problems for your organisation?

No, a 10MB with a 1000 limit on the PMD and VMD is appropriate.

Question 9: Does limiting the number of transactions within the MTRD group mitigate the potential problems caused by an increased maximum file size?

Yes, a 10MB with a 1000 limit on the PMD and VMD is appropriate.

Question 10: Is the volume limit of 1000 transactions per file appropriate for the PMD and VMD transactions?

Yes, a 10MB with a 1000 limit on the PMD and VMD is appropriate.

Question 11: Does your organisation have any concerns about the cost or business risk associated with the above changes? If so, please specify which change in particular concerns your organisation and why.

We are concern about the amount of changes proposed to occur at the same time. For example the 5MS and the NEM Customer Switching program are proposing a B2M schema change in December 2020. This places extra cost and risk on us to implement successfully and also having to deal with other participant who may not of successfully implemented their solution.

Question 12: If your organisation raised concerns in the above question, what alternative less-costly solutions might meet the requirements for the changes outlined in section 5?

We believe that delaying this change can help to mitigate the concerns and risks highlighted above.

Question 13: If one or more of the changes proposed in this document were to be adopted, would your organisation prefer an implementation date of 2 December 2020 or November 2021?

We would prefer November 2021 for the reasons highlighted above.

Question 14: Do you see value in the development of new Verify Standing Data Transactions?

Yes, we see value in developing new Verify Standing Data transactions.

If "No":

Question 15: Please provide reasons why you do not see value in the development of a new Verify Standing Data transaction.

N/A



If "Yes":

Question 16: What areas of Standing Data are causing you issues today (please list individually)?

Enquiries related to NMI standing data

- Enquiries related to the site address
- Enquiries related to NMI standing data such as NMI Class, Customer Threshold Code and NMI status

Enquiries related to meter standing data

- Enquiries related to when a was meter installed and how it was configured
- Enquiries related to meter standing data such as register and suffixes and meter status
- Enquiries related to meter faults

Question 17: Who is involved in the interactions to resolve the issue (e.g. Retailer to Distributor – please list and link to each data item from Question 14)?

Retailer to Distributor: Enquiries related to NMI standing data

Retailer to Metering Provider: Enquiries related to meter standing data

Distributor to Metering Provider: Enquiries related to meter standing data

Question 18: What are the volumes of each type of Standing Data item (please list and link to each data item from Question 14)?

Retailer to Distributor: Enquiries related to NMI standing data – approximately 10 per month

Retailer to Metering Provider: Enquiries related to meter standing data – approximately 10 per month

Distributor to Metering Provider: Enquiries related to meter standing data – approximately 150 per month

Question 19: To resolve the issue, is there a need for multiple interactions between parties to gain a full understanding of the issue and agree the resolution (please list and link to each data item from Question 14)?

We believe that the Verify Standing Data should operate in a similar manner to the Verify Meter Data with a request and response transaction

Question 20: If pursued, which B2B Procedure should these new transactions be included within?

We believe that the Verify Standing Data should be included in the Meter Data Procedure with the procedure rename to a more appropriate name like 'Meter Data, Metering and Standing Data Procedure'

Question 21: Do you have any further information/thoughts that would be relevant to this topic (please provide)?

We believe that the Verify Standing Data should be included in a new and separate Transaction Group to help distinguish this from other transactions